

25X1A

1

## NOTE ON THE "ADEQUACY SURVEYS"

There were apparently three OCD Surveys. The first (December 1946) and the second (May 1947) are here. The third seems to have been started in January 1948, and it would appear that quite a lot of work was done on it. Although I am not quite at the end of my rope yet, inquiries lead me to believe that just as they were getting to the point of finishing the thing, Olsen and his people left in favor of Andrews and his; there was a great reorganization with the usual loss of files. I should not be surprised if the item numbered "I" below is the sole survivor of Survey #3. I have a couple of people still working on it, and something more may be found yet.

**This is a TEMPORARY DOCUMENT  
only, for the use of DCI/HS.**

The record copy has been  
released to National Archives  
under the HISTORICAL REVIEW PROGRAM.

Date 3 JAN 91 HRP 89-2

This document has been  
approved for release through  
the HISTORICAL REVIEW PROGRAM of  
the Central Intelligence Agency.

Date 3 JAN 91

HRP 89-2

000025

CONTENTS IN THIS FILE: Numerals refer to yellow slips

25X1A

I. This interview with [ ] seems to be all that remains of the  
25X1A

Third Adequacy Survey which was begun in January 1948. [ ] rather threatening  
tone regarding the budget seems to reflect a dissatisfaction with CIA, though he

expresses himself as satisfied with the Summaries. It would appear that [ ] 25X1A

by this time, has begun to think of CIA as primarily an institution that furnishes  
the other Agencies with material they need that is not within their specialty. If

so, CIA is working for IAC---not vice versa. May have been normal Navy point of  
view---see Situation Reports. Do not think ORE ever got into business of

furnishing Navy's non-Naval intelligence on request. Think ORE would have agreed  
with implication that ONI get out of the political intelligence business.

II. This is part of controversy that runs all through this folder. Office after  
office wanted to receive CIA current intelligence or get extra copies. Requests  
generally approved. State's objection recorded here based mostly on fact that  
ORE received and could use the so-called State S/S traffic which supposed to be  
high policy and very sensitive. Hence many subscribers cut off. List continued  
to grow nevertheless. What interests me is State's blythe assumption that it at  
liberty to withhold intelligence whenever it chose---that CIA received anything  
only through sufferance.

III. This is 7 May Survey which we already have.

IV. Survey of December 9, 1946, which we didn't have before as far as I know.

It looks very much like the one of five months later. I am commenting serially on page 1 of same - reference to numbered paragraphs.

(1) Problem behind this runs throughout history. Because of State and other pressure, necessary to have very restricted distribution if anything at all sensitive to be included. This, of course, hampered some offices where the very people who should have seen the Summaries didn't. Proposals made here carried out in 1951: OCI, in effect, prints periodical for every shade of taste and state of clearance.

(2) As I said concerning 1947 Survey---what these people wanted was not "Comments" on items of current intelligence, but just plain further explanations. The conciseness of the Summaries---that so many professed to admire- and might have been a time-saver for a thoroughly informed person---simply made many of the items unintelligible for non-experts in areas.

(3) "not oriented toward anything" is a reflection of the same thing. The items were "oriented" toward something all right, but no one wrote a paragraph telling the AC/AS-2 or the DCNO (Op) what it was. See same in (4), (5), and (6) except that in (6) the commenter tries to ascribe his own ignorance to the "CIA Briefing

(7) The Weekly Articles were far from long. Rather, the rules of brevity and factuality were so rigid that the articles were not interesting. If the matter contained in them turned out to be not what the reader wanted, he resented the boredom of having to find this out the hard way. Hence the request for a synopsis. The synopsis method was adopted in about 1949 in the form of "Highlights of the Week" on the first page of the Weekly.

(8) "They might well have begun to be bored with Communism---but what were you going to do?

(1) A nasty diplomatic way of saying that State, as an already superior organization, had no need of the help from the CIA tyros. It was true that almost all of the material on which the summaries were based came from State ---so why throw it back again---but this did not necessarily excuse State's patronizing attitude. (See later coordination troubles)

V. Again the problem of high and low level---limited or less limited distribution.